

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated October 4, 2004. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the objections/rejections set forth in the Office Action in view of these remarks, and the above claim amendments. Applicant thanks the examiner for his indication of allowability of claims 8-18, 22-27, 34-35, 37-39, and 43.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to the above claims 8-18, 22-27, 34-35, 37-39, and 43 for being dependent on a rejected base claim. Claims 3 and 8 have been cancelled and the limitations thereof were added to claim 1. Thus, claim 1 has been amended to be claim 8 in independent form. Claims 2-20 (except cancelled claims 3 and 8) are originally presented or are now amended to depend from amended claim 1. Claim 22 has been cancelled and rewritten to be in independent form by adding its limitations to amended claim 21. Claims 23-30 are originally presented or are now amended to depend from amended claim 21. Claim 34 has been cancelled and rewritten to be in independent form by adding its limitations to amended claim 31. Claims 33-45 (except cancelled claim 34) are originally presented or are now amended to depend from amended claim 34. Thus, original claims 8-18, 22-27, 34-35, 37-39, and 43, should be allowable over the examiner's objection, because they have been rewritten in independent form.

In the Office Action claims 1, 7, 20-21, 30-33, 36, 40-42, 45-46, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poirier (U.S. 6,625,433). Regarding claims 1, 7, and 20, claim 1 as mentioned above is now original claim 8 rewritten in independent form, and per the examiner's indication of allowability should thus be allowable. Claim 20 is now dependent on amended claim 1 and should thus also be allowable.

Regarding claims 21 and 30, claim 21 as mentioned above is original claim 22 rewritten in independent form, and per the examiner's indication of allowability should thus be allowable. Claim 30 is now dependent on amended claim 21, and thus should also be allowable.

Regarding claims 31-33, 36, 40-42, and 45, claim 31 as mentioned above is the original claim 34 rewritten in independent form, and per the examiner's indication of allowability should thus be allowable. Claim 32 was cancelled. Claims 33, 36, 40-42, and 45 are now dependent on amended claim 31 and should thus also be allowable. Furthermore, claims 40-42 were originally dependent on claim 34, which was indicated to be allowed; these claims should not have been rejected because they were dependent on an allowed claim.

Claims 46 and 49 have been amended to add the limitations of original claim 34. Claim 34 was given an indication of allowability. Thus, these claims should be allowable because they have been amended to include the same limitations of a claim that was indicated to be allowed.

Claims 2-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Poirier in view Bizjak et al. (Pub. No.: U.S. 2003/0035549). Claim 3 was cancelled. Claims 2, and 4-5 depend from amended claim 1, which has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 8, which was indicated to be allowable. Thus, claims 2, and 4-5 should be allowable because they are dependent on a claim that was indicated to be allowable.

Claims 19, 28-29, and 47-48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Poirier in view of Vu (U.S. Patent No. 6,002,925). Claim 19 is dependant on amended claim 1 and should thus be allowable for the reasons stated above. Claims 28-29 are dependant on amended claim 21 and should thus be allowable for the reasons stated above. Claim 47 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 34, which was indicated to be allowed. Claim 48 is dependent on claim 47. Accordingly, both claims 47 and 48 should be allowable.

Claim 44 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Poirier in view of Baghdady (U.S. Patent No. 3,909,725). Claim 44 is dependent on amended claim 31 and should be allowable because claim 31 is original claim 34 in independent rewritten form that was indicated to be allowable.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Poirier in view of Bizjak, and in further view of Kurihara (U.S. Patent No. 6,731,703). Claim 6 is dependent on amended claim 1. Thus, claim 6 should be allowable because amended claim 1 is original claim 8 (which was indicated to be allowable) rewritten in independent form.

New claims 50-66 should be allowable because they are all based on claim 50, which is original claim 1 with the added limitation of only original claim 8. Because the examiner indicated the allowability of original claim 8, new claims 50-66 should also be allowable.


New claims 67-78 should be allowable because they are all based on claim 67 which is original claim 31 with the added limitation of only original claim 34. Because the examiner indicated the allowability of original claim 34, new claims 67-78 should also be allowable.

New claims 79-81 should be allowable because they all incorporate the limitation given in original claim 34. Because the examiner indicated the allowability of original claim 34, new claims 79-81 should also be allowable.

It is believed that the claims, as now presented, are in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

JONES DAY


David B. Cochran

(Reg. No. 39,142)

Jones Day
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7506